

# IRANICA IN POST-ACHAEMENID BABYLONIAN TEXTS<sup>1</sup>

Matthew W. Stolper  
Oriental Institute  
University of Chicago

## 1. Introduction

In Telegdi's study of Iranian loanwords in the Aramaic of the Talmud, he looked at the chronology of the loans according to the Old and Middle Iranian phonetic developments that they reflect. He concluded that most of the Iranian loanwords, including the more basic and more common words, were pre-Sassanian. He observed that many of them have counterparts in other Aramaic dialects, and he inferred that these loanwords must have been transmitted through Imperial Aramaic. Even though Imperial Aramaic was still widely used in the Seleucid Era, it was then probably a more vigorous medium for distributing Greek loanwords than Iranian loanwords. Hence, most of the older Iranian words in the Talmud were of Achaemenid date (Telegdi 1935:228).

This conclusion fits comfortably with the current dominant view of Achaemenid-Hellenistic continuity, according to which Achaemenid institutions and relationships were not parts of an alien political veneer, to be swept away under Greco-Macedonian rule. Rather, they were parts of the imperial framework on which Hellenistic political and social structures were built (e.g., Boiy 2000:268). We could expect Iranian words and names in Hellenistic Babylonian texts to reflect this. All other things being equal, we could expect Iranian common nouns and proper names of the kinds found in Achaemenid Babylonian texts to persist, especially in early Hellenistic Babylonian texts. We could expect Iranian nouns and names to be distributed in later Seleucid texts in a way that might reflect the coexistence of Achaemenid elements with Greek institutions and populations, or the gradual replacement of one by the other. We could expect Iranian nouns and names to become more frequent in Arsacid Babylonian texts, after the Iranian re-conquest of Babylonia.

Similar views were voiced, for example, by G.J.P. McEwan, whose study of the Hellenistic Babylonian temple began by postulating that

[the Macedonian takeover] was a coup d'état, which replaced the rulers while leaving the basic structure of the imperial administration basically unchanged. Such changes as occurred were the result of a gradual reshaping of the structures to fit the needs of the Greek ruling class and the creation of Greek institutions, which were intended to meet the needs of the Greek population, rather than to supplant local institutions (McEwan 1981:vii)

---

<sup>1</sup> Draft for presentation and discussion at the conference on "La transition entre l'empire achéménide et les royaumes hellénistiques (vers 350-300)," at the Collège de France, 22-23 November 2004. Most references have not been checked. Not for quotation or citation in this form without author's permission. Correction and critique are welcome.

Akkadian texts are cited with the abbreviations of the Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago (CAD), with this exception: AION Suppl. 77 = Stolper 1993.

and whose closing inferences include the observations that

[v]ery few new [administrative and professional] titles occur for the first time in the Hellenistic period and of those that do the majority are clearly Babylonian in origin [the list in n. 423 includes one Iranian title, two Greek titles]. Furthermore, relatively few titles were taken over from the Persian period [the list in n. 424 includes three, perhaps four, Iranian titles] ... Only two Greek titles are found (*dioikētēs* and *prostatēs*), and both refer to Greek administrative officers. (McEwan 1981:184f.)

Oelsner considered that contemporary Iranian dialects were not reflected in Hellenistic Babylonian sources, and even under Arsacid rule, Iranian language was confined to the rulers, without impact on Babylonian written material. Inherited Iranian items were negligible (Oelsner 1986:147). Boiy saw the effect of political circumstances somewhat differently, finding many Iranian titles in Hellenistic texts from Babylon, seeing them as the persistent Achaemenid inheritance, and considering the larger number of Iranian names in astronomical diaries of Arsacid date to mark the reassertion of Iranian rule (Boiy 2000:268).

The terms of comparison are uneven. Achaemenid cuneiform sources greatly outweigh post-Achaemenid ones. There are more Achaemenid texts and they represent more archives or archive fragments. They represent a greater range of formal types, they record a greater range of transactions and behaviors, and they transmit more Iranian words and names.

Iranian common nouns appear in Babylonian texts very soon after the Achaemenid conquest of Babylonia (e.g., *pardēsu* [\**pardēsa*-] Cyr. 212:3, 533 B.C.). Over time they become more numerous, but many occur only once or twice. Others are found in only one or two archival sources. Iranian administrative terms are especially common in texts dealing with contract agriculture. They are not connected with farming itself and only indirectly connected with the juridical conditions of contracting; rather, they are connected with the people involved, as property holders, rentiers, or their agents. The unusually large number of items in the Murašû archive probably reflects peculiarities of the Murašûs' social and political connections.

All this suggests that those parts of Babylonian society that used written records made frequent contact with Iranian institutions, but mostly under exceptional conditions. Even so, a generalization based only on frequency of written occurrences neglects other indications of Iranian presence in current language. Cautionary examples are the words *aḥšadrapanu* 'satrap,' *ammarkaru* 'accountant,' *ardabu* 'artabe (measure),' *ganzabarru* 'treasurer.' They are all sparsely attested in Achaemenid Babylonian texts, but all have counterparts in other languages of the Achaemenid Empire and its successors, all recur in post-Achaemenid Babylonian texts, and all, therefore, probably more common in Achaemenid Babylonia than the surviving written occurrences alone suggest.

Iranian personal names also begin to appear in Babylonian texts soon after the Achaemenid conquest, at first marking the establishment of Iranian political control (e.g., *Gūbaru* [\**Gaubaruva*-], appointed satrap in 535 BC or earlier). They appear with

increasing frequency. Iranian names occur with Babylonian (or West Semitic) patronyms and Babylonian names occur with Iranian patronyms. People with Iranian names occur almost everywhere and at almost every social level in legal and administrative texts, but they are absent from the small number of texts connected with temples and their properties.

All this permits the view that Iranians moved into Babylonian society mostly from the top down, that intermarriage and acculturation were reciprocal and perhaps widespread, but that the populations connected with temples were perhaps more conservative than the society at large. We could expect Hellenes and Hellenic institutions to do something similar after the Macedonian conquest. We could expect to find Greeks occupying or overseeing Babylonian and specifically Achaemenid administrative posts, and also to find Greeks having children with Babylonians who were already related to Iranians, at least in the first generations after the conquest.

There are far fewer post-Achaemenid Babylonian legal and administrative texts than Achaemenid documents: hundreds, rather than thousands. They come from fewer places: most are from Uruk in the south and Babylon in the north; isolates or small groups are from Larsa in the south, Nippur in central Babylonia, and Borsippa, Cutha, and Kish-Hursagkalama in the north. They come from a narrower range of social and economic contexts. Some deal with aspects of land tenure and land use (Van der Spek 1986, 1995), but none with contract agriculture. Most record transactions by people connected, directly or indirectly, with temples (McEwan 1981: 3, Oelsner 1978:108, Joannès 2000:160 and others, but contrast Doty 1977:150f.), the very population least “Iranized” in earlier texts. The frequency of Greek names in these texts, however, shows that the population represented in them was not socially isolated (below §3).

Post-Achaemenid literary, learned and scientific texts, almost all from Uruk and Babylon, are much more numerous than similar Achaemenid texts, but their contents are immune to the political and linguistic context. The conspicuous exceptions are the chronicles and the short “historical” passages of the astronomical diaries.<sup>2</sup> The literary and learned archives nevertheless show plainly that a very high order of training in cuneiform was available. If Babylonians no longer recorded very much of their legal, administrative and economic activity on clay and in cuneiform, the reason was not that they could not learn the cuneiform scribal craft.

All in all, there are not very many Iranian nouns and names in post-Achaemenid Babylonian texts, even with generous assumptions about what might be Iranian. I append a collection of items culled from texts written between the fourth and first centuries BC, including 12 common nouns and 4 doubtful and uncertain items, and 28 proper names and 4 doubtful and uncertain items. To summarize:

Of the common nouns, 11 appear in early Hellenistic or Seleucid texts,<sup>3</sup> 4 in Arsacid texts,<sup>4</sup> and 1 in texts of both periods.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> And, in another way, the “Greco-Babyloniaca” texts, not germane here.

<sup>3</sup> *abistātu*?, <sup>ACH</sup>*ahšadrapānu*, <sup>ACH</sup>*ardabu*, *azdākara*, <sup>ACH</sup>*dātabarru*, <sup>ACH</sup>*dātu*, <sup>ACH</sup>*ganzabarru*, <sup>ACH</sup>*gardu ’a*?, *iterišupātu*?, *zēnabarru*. Here and throughout, <sup>ACH</sup> indicates that the word or

Of the 11 common nouns in early Hellenistic or Seleucid texts, 7 also appear in Achaemenid Babylonian texts and 1 in other Achaemenid sources.

Of the 4 common nouns in Arsacid texts, 2 also appear in Achaemenid Babylonian texts, and 1 in the Babylonian version of an Achaemenid inscription.

The single common noun that appears in both Seleucid and Arsacid texts (*ammarkaru*) also appears in Achaemenid Babylonian texts and other Achaemenid and post-Achaemenid sources.

Of the proper names, 14 appear in early Hellenistic or Seleucid texts,<sup>6</sup> 18 in Arsacid texts,<sup>7</sup> none in texts of both periods.

Of the 14 names in early Hellenistic or Seleucid texts, 4 also appear in Achaemenid Babylonian texts.

Of the 18 names in Arsacid texts, 5 also appear in Achaemenid Babylonian texts; 7 are names of kings and queens.

The distribution of these items over time is broadly consistent with our historical presumptions. There are more Iranian common nouns in Seleucid texts than in Arsacid texts, consistent with the presumption that some Achaemenid institutions remained in place—or else that some Achaemenid terminology had become common enough to be useful in new circumstances. There are more Iranian personal names in Arsacid texts than in Seleucid texts, consistent with the presumption that the return of Iranian rule meant more Iranian impact on Babylonia. Some of the Iranian names in Arsacid texts are the names of kings and queens found in date formulas, colophons, or the “historical” passages of astronomical diaries, and all of the others are the names of princes, generals, or officials. Hence, these names reflect the political facts of Arsacid rule, having little to do with the conditions of Arsacid Babylonian society.

Some items in the appended list suggest comments that may allow us to refine or emend these generalizations.

## 2. Survival or Recurrence of Common Nouns

A few of the Iranian items in post-Achaemenid Babylonian texts belong to the common Achaemenid legacy to the ancient world, with counterpart words from the same donor forms found in Aramaic, Greek, and other languages of the Achaemenid territories, their surroundings and successors.

---

name is also attested in Achaemenid Babylonian texts; ? indicates uncertainty about the Iranian source of the word.

<sup>4</sup> *apadāna*, *kumarru*??, <sup>ACH</sup>*uppudētu*.

<sup>5</sup> <sup>ACH</sup>*ammarkaru*.

<sup>6</sup> <sup>ACH</sup>*Apammu*, *Artasāri*?, *Bagamasta* (*Bagabarta*), <sup>ACH</sup>*Bēsu*?, *Gūpāra*, <sup>ACH</sup>*Indaparnu*, *Mitrā*, *Mitriupastu*, *Nabarzānu*, *Pāpa*, *Piršinā*?, *Pirita*?, *Rēmā*?

<sup>7</sup> *Ar* <sup>ACH</sup>*abūzānā*, <sup>ACH</sup>*Artabānā*, <sup>ACH</sup>*Aspasinē*, *Aspastānu*, *Asiabatar*?, <sup>ACH</sup>*Bagajāšā*, *Gūtazā*, *Indupanē*?, *Ispubarzā*, <sup>ACH</sup>*Mitradātu*, <sup>ACH</sup>*Mitrātu*, *Piriustānā*, *Raznumitrā*, *Rē* <sup>ACH</sup>*inu*, *Tigrānu*, *Urri* <sup>ACH</sup>*a*, *Urudā* (*Urudēsu*), *Urraḥšu*?

a. *aḥšadrapānu*

The most conspicuous and most ubiquitous Achaemenid Iranian word is ‘satrap.’ The Babylonian form, *aḥšadrapānu*, is rarely (if ever) used in Babylonian to refer to the provincial governor of Babylonia.<sup>8</sup> Most Achaemenid Babylonian references to provincial governors use variations on the titles *pīḫātu* or *bēl pīḫāti*. In this respect, Achaemenid Babylonian texts preserve Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian usage despite the fact that the province of Babylonia and Syria, later of Babylonia alone, was a new political and administrative entity, without parallel in the earlier empires. In post-Achaemenid Babylonian texts, most references to provincial governors use an old word in a new sense, *muma ’iru*, literally ‘commander,’ sometimes written logographically LÚ.GAL UKKIN, literally ‘chief of the assembly’ (below). In this case, then, Achaemenid Babylonian shows a persistence of indigenous pre-Achaemenid terminology despite a change in the reality that it labels. By contrast, post-Achaemenid Babylonian does not adopt a loanword, but changes from an inherited Babylonian term to a newly coined usage based on older Babylonian elements (below).

At least one Achaemenid Babylonian text, however, uses *aḥšadrapānu* in a generic sense, referring to an office and its authority, rather than in an identifying sense, referring to an office-holder. PBS 2/1 21 (424 B.C.) is a contract for the release of a distrained person. It mentions the possibility of a complaint lodged before “king, satrap, or judge.” Here, ‘satrap’ refers not to political or administrative power, but to judicial authority at a level below the royal and above the local.<sup>9</sup> The single Arsacid occurrence of the title (BRM 2 56:19. 128 BC or later), has similar generic sense, referring to the office rather than a specific official, and it also refers to judicial rather than political or administrative authority. The text records a sale of rights to income in the form of rations, entitles the buyer to demand that the seller make an oral declaration of the sale before the ‘satrap.’

These two texts use the title with similar nuance in similar situations, but each uses it in exceptional phrases. That is, this is not an instance of formal continuity of legal formulas, disconnected from historical circumstances. It may rather be either a matter of an actual persistence of Achaemenid practice or else a matter of the reinstallation of something similar, characterized in similar terms, under Arsacid rule.

---

<sup>8</sup> Schmitt 1976; Stolper 1989:288f., especially 291 sub p; Dandamayev 1992:5ff., with references and literature.

<sup>9</sup> *pūt mimma dīni u ragāmu lā šūmudu ša PN ana šarri LÚ aḥ-šá-ad-ra-pa-nu u dajjāni ana muḥḥika lā ušāmadu našāku ... ina ūmu PN ana šarri LÚ aḥ-šá-ad-ra-pa-nu u dajjānu ina muḥḥi PN<sub>2</sub> ultāmidu*: I guarantee that I will bring a lawsuit or lodge a complaint against you to king, satrap, or judge ... If PN makes a charge against PN<sub>2</sub> to king, satrap, or judge (he will pay a fine) PBS 2/1 21:7 and 11 (Darius II, year 1). A broken passage of Stolper Entrepreneurs and Empire No. 109 also cites a ‘satrap’ by title, perhaps by name, in similar context, as Dandamayev 1992:6 remarks.

b. *ammarkaru*, *ganzabarru*

Other ubiquitous Achaemenid titles are \*ganzabara-, ‘treasurer,’ and \*hamāarakara-, ‘accountant,’ both with reflexes in Achaemenid Babylonian texts and in Seleucid Babylonian texts.<sup>10</sup>

In Achaemenid Babylonian, *ganzabarru* appears (as yet) only in texts from the reign of Darius I, referring to a single man. His name is Iranian, *Bāgasarū* (\*Bāgasrava-). He held property near Babylon managed by subordinates and entrepreneurs. Other texts give him a Babylonian title, *rab kāširi*, that may be an attempt to translate Iranian \*ganzabara-.<sup>11</sup> All this suggests that the official was a man high status, perhaps comparable to the royal treasurer (*gzbr*) at Babylon, Mithradāta, named in the Old Testament account of the return of the Jewish exiles,<sup>12</sup> but the use of an Iranian word suggests that something about the office—whether status or function—was new to Achaemenid government.<sup>13</sup>

By contrast, the title *ammarkaru* (with various spellings), ‘accountant,’ appears only in late Achaemenid texts, identifying several different men, all with Babylonian names, serving as witnesses to legal documents—that is, Babylonians who actually attended the places where commercial activity and legal recording were carried out. This loanword appears to indicate an office or function that had become thoroughly embedded in a level of Babylonian society below the controlling elite installed by the Iranian rulers.

Considering the widespread and long-lasting use of counterpart loanwords in other languages, it is not surprising to find that in Hellenistic Babylonia both of these titles were used widely (*ammarkaru* in Babylon and Nippur, *ganzabarru* in Babylon [probably] and Uruk), and for a long time (both until near the end of Seleucid control). More striking is the fact that in Hellenistic use, both titles belong to upper ranks of temple administration, a sector of Babylonian society where they are not found in Achaemenid texts, a sector that otherwise showed a preference for preserving or even reintroducing Akkadian administrative titles (McEwan 1981:184f.). But since the earliest post-Achaemenid uses of the terms do not clearly belong to this sector, this extension of their use may be a Seleucid development, not a reflection of continuity of Achaemenid Babylonian institutions.

c. *dātabarru*, *dātu*

---

<sup>10</sup> \*ganzabara- (with reflexes in Akkadian, Aramaic, Elamite, Middle Persian, Parthian, Hebrew, Arabic, etc.): Stolper 2000; Tavernier 2000:689. \*hmāarakara- (with reflexes in Akkadian, Aramaic, Middle Persian, Parthian, Armenian): Eilers 1940:55; Greenfield 1940:180f.; Hinz 1975:121 Dandamayev 1992:36f.; Tavernier 2000:691.

<sup>11</sup> But see Bongenaar 1997:136f. on the problems of identifying *rab kāšir(i)* as a synonym of *ganzabarru*.

<sup>12</sup> Dandamayev 1968; 1992:61.

<sup>13</sup> I venture to speculate that *rab kāširi* was an inadequate translation, that a better Akkadian counterpart would be *mašennu*, and that the use of *mašennu* in later Achaemenid Babylonian texts might account for the strange absence of the otherwise ubiquitous \*ganzabara-.

Similarly ubiquitous in Achaemenid and post-Achaemenid languages are reflexes of \*dātabara-, ‘judge,’ and dāta-, ‘law.’ Despite these common translations, just what Achaemenid Babylonian *dātabarru* did and to what Achaemenid Babylonian *dātu* refers is still a matter of uncertainty. Achaemenid *dātabarru* have both Babylonian and Iranian names and they appear as witnesses to legal texts, present at the ordinary conduct of business activity. In the Murašû texts from the reign of Artaxerxes I, the title is carried by only one man, called *dātabarru* of Artareme, the satrap of Babylonia, just as other Murašû texts from the reign of Darius II sometimes refer to a judge (LÚ.DI.KUD) of the satrap Gobryas or of the queen Parysatis.<sup>14</sup> This usage suggests that the title refers literally to the holder of a commission given by the satrap (or his political counterpart). The word *dātu*, however, refers specifically to something coming from the king, not from his governors, whether it is to be understood generally, as a ‘law,’ or specifically, as a *firmān* issued to settle a particular situation.<sup>15</sup>

Like the post-Achaemenid occurrences of *ganzabarru* and *ammarkaru*, the single known Seleucid occurrence of *dātabarru* falls surprisingly in the realm of temple administration.

Like the pre-Achaemenid occurrences of *dātu*, however, the post-Achaemenid occurrences refer to something originating with the king, and at least three of them refer specifically to a single written provision. I can add nothing to my earlier speculations on this usage:

If the procedure of converting deposits to interest-bearing obligations ... did begin under Achaemenid rule, then a royal regulation bearing on this procedure might also have come from an Achaemenid ruler, remaining in force under the Seleucids, cited by Babylonian scribes with a term retained since its Achaemenid origin.

...  
[But] if the *dātu* in question was indeed Achaemenid, its appearance in legal texts written more than a century after the last Achaemenid reigned is remarkable, both because an Achaemenid edict was still available for citation, and because the drafters of the contracts imputed current validity to it.<sup>16</sup>

#### d. *uppuḍētu*

For the least ubiquitous of the borrowed Iranian nouns found both in Achaemenid and post-Achaemenid Babylonian texts, *uppuḍētu*, there is near-consensus on a probable etymology and on a generic translation ‘overseer.’<sup>17</sup> Counterparts are not yet found in

<sup>14</sup> It is conceivable this or other late Achaemenid Babylonian uses of the logogram LÚ.DI.KUD conceal the loanword *dātabarru*, but the phrase *ša muḥḫi dātu*, to identify one of a panel of adjudicators of an administrative matter seems to be a partial translation of *dātabarru* meant to distinguish it from LÚ.DI.KUD, ‘judge,’ the title of other members of the same panel.

<sup>15</sup> Briant 1996:981-983. Stolper 1993:60ff.

<sup>16</sup> Stolper 1993:60, 62.

<sup>17</sup> Dandamayev 1992:7,135 prefers to interpret the title as ‘(city) governor.’ With the odd Achaemenid variant transcribing the postulated Ir. \*<sup>h</sup>upa with *appa-* (if not a scribal error), cf. PN Ummadātu ~ Ammadātu = [ʾ]mdt or [hw]mdt; see Stolper 1996.

non-Babylonian Achaemenid sources. Even the often-cited Parthian counterpart, *ʾwpdyt*, is not a title, but a personal name, evidently the name of a satrap (Schmitt 1998:170, 193 sub I.20).

Achaemenid Babylonian occurrences are all early, from the reigns of Cambyses and Darius I. Holders of the title have names that are both Iranian (only in a Babylonian text drawn up in Persia) and Babylonian (always in texts from Babylonia). They appear in legal and administrative documents alongside other men entitled ‘judge’, in one case, also along side a man called *ša muḫḫi dātu*, but not in ordinary lists of witnesses.<sup>18</sup>

The single post-Achaemenid occurrence comes about a generation after the Arsacid conquest, from the reign of Aspasiṇē (Hyspaosines) of Characene. The text, BOR 4 132, again comes from temple administration, indeed from the Esagil at Babylon, but this time we are faced with an exceptional amount of information about the title holder, Itti-Marduk-balāṭu. He was a member of an old family, attested since the sixth century BC and for seven generations. Members of his family were scholars, the scribes and owners of literary astronomical texts. He himself was a cult-singer (*kalû*) and the owner of a manuscript of the Gilgamesh Epic (Oelsner 1964, 2000:802-807). BOR 4 132 specifies him with three phrases: as *rab banî* (i.e., holder of the *rab banûtu* prebend) in the vicinity<sup>2</sup> of Babylon, as *uppudētu* of temples, and as Enuma-Anu-Enlil scribe, that is, astrologer. The text records a pronouncement arising from an agreement between the *šatammu* of the Esagil temple and the general assembly of the temple, conferring Itti-Marduk-balāṭu’s annual income from the temple on his two sons, who were already qualified and active astronomical observers. The stated occasion for the transfer is that the temple<sup>19</sup> had sent Itti-Marduk-balāṭu to the king and he was therefore drawing his income from the palace organization rather than from the temple.<sup>20</sup>

The problem, of course, is to guess what, if any, of this has to do with the title *uppudētu*. On the face of it, the issue of the text is the man’s income from the temple. If it includes both the money paid for his work as astrologer and his prebend income, it must also include payments made to him in the capacity of *uppudētu*. In that case, this text is a mirror image of one of the earlier occurrences of the title, VAS 6 128, in which an *appadētu*<sup>2</sup> is part of a panel that ratified a reassignment of ration payment to others.

Furthermore, although the holder of the title is connected with the temple—like the men called, e.g., *ganzabarru* and *ammarkaru*—the form of the title and the general import of

---

<sup>18</sup> The document written in Persia, in the reign of Cambyses, is a record of the sale of a slave, in extraordinary form, drawn up before men with various titles, including an “*uppadētu* of the land of Ḫumadēšu,” i.e., the district of the later Persepolis (Hebraica 8 134). Two documents written in Babylon late in the reign of Darius I, deal with the use of dowry property, drawn up before panels of three judges and an *uppadētu* (AfO 42-43 61f. Nos. 11 and 12). An administrative text recording the assignment of income in barley and flour, from Borsippa in the early reign of Darius I, was drawn up before a panel of two judges, a man entitled *ša muḫḫi dātum*, another entitled *appadētu*, and other men with administrative titles (VAS 6 128).

<sup>19</sup> “We”, i.e., the *šatammu* and *kiništu*.

<sup>20</sup> *hišihṭi ina bāb ekalli*, line 7 contrasted with payment to be made *ina hišihṭini*, line 22.



the text suggest that the office was not part of the standing organization of the specific temple, Esagil, itself.

There is no clear connection between the early Achaemenid Babylonian uses of the title and its Arsacid Babylonian use to suggest that the recurrence of the title represents a survival of Achaemenid administrative practice or institutions.

*e. artabu, apadāna*

Of the few common nouns of Iranian origin found in both Achaemenid and post-Achaemenid Babylonian that are not titles or parts of titles, the most widely attested is *artabu*, ‘(the measure) artabe.’ Comparable forms appear in Aramaic, Demotic, Elamite and Greek. In Achaemenid Elamite texts from Persepolis the artabe is part of the ordinary system of measurement of capacity. In Achaemenid Babylonian, however, the word has appeared as yet only twice: once early, in an administrative text from the reign of Cambyses, and once late, in a legal text from the reign of Artaxerxes I (where it occurs beside the usual Babylonian measures of capacity).<sup>21</sup> In the administrative text, the choice of the Iranian loanword might have been an idiosyncrasy of the clerk who wrote the record or of the office for which he worked. The legal text, however, was in principle an enforceable contract. To be enforceable, the terms had to be comprehensible. Hence, the use of the Iranian term implies a general recognition of the word and its precise value as a measure.<sup>22</sup> It seems likely that this word and the measure to which it refers were more widely used in Achaemenid Babylonia than the two written attestations would suggest.

The post-Achaemenid occurrences of *artabu* are numerous but concentrated. They all come from one group of texts, and they may all be from one hand. All are in administrative letter-orders belonging to the Brewer’s Archive from a temple of Nabû, probably in Borsippa, written in the reigns of Alexander III, Alexander IV and Antigonos. Other texts of the same kind from the same source make it clear that the Iranian loanword *artabu* is a perfect synonym for the common Babylonian word *mašīḫu*, ‘measure.’ If it was a perfect synonym, it was a genuine loanword, not a foreign word for special purpose. This inference furthers the suggestion that the Iranian word had entered common use in Achaemenid Babylonian language—whether Akkadian or Aramaic. But at the same time, since the system of Babylonian measures of capacity was not altered or replaced, this synonymy also suggests that the word had nothing to do with any specifically Achaemenid institution or practice. What survived into the first years of Macedonian was just a word. Its survival implies more for Achaemenid Babylonian usage than for post-Achaemenid Babylonian history.

The post-Achaemenid Babylonian *apadāna* has a nearly opposite implication. The word does not actually appear in any Achaemenid text from Babylonia, but only in the Babylonian version of a late Achaemenid inscription from Susa (A<sup>2</sup>Sa). The late Arsacid occurrence refers specifically to a building in Seleucia. Since the building cannot be an

---

<sup>21</sup> Camb. 316 and JCS 53 113 No. 12, see Stolper 2001:115.

<sup>22</sup> But I do not know the precise value intended. At Persepolis in the time of Darius I, the artabe was 30 QA; at Uruk in the time of Nebuchadnezzar II, the *mašīḫu* was 45 QA (Beaulieu 1989).

Achaemenid survival, there is no reason to suppose that the word is an Achaemenid survival. It is more likely to be a convergent Arsacid Iranian term, reintroduced into Babylonia, than an Achaemenid term preserved by the Seleucid conquerors and adopted by their Arsacid successors. In either of these cases, the word is a symptom of what rulers of Babylonia did, not what Babylonian society preserved and transmitted to its rulers.

### 3. Acculturation

That the populations represented in post-Achaemenid legal and administrative texts were not socially isolated is evident from combinations of Babylonian and Greek names and patronyms and sometimes Babylonian-Greek double names, especially in the Uruk texts. They, imply intermarriage, acculturation, and social or political opportunism, but Iranian names are no longer involved.<sup>23</sup>

The material includes only one case of an Iranian name with Babylonian patronym, (Mitrā, son of Bēl- [...]). It is in a text from 305 BC, so it does not have any implication for post-Achaemenid circumstances, for the father must have given his son an Iranian name in the final moments of Achaemenid control. The material includes only one case of a Babylonian name with an Iranian patronym (Bēl-ḫatīnī', son of Gūpāru), from the reign of Antiochus I.

Combinations of Iranian and Greek names appear only at the highest political levels. The Iranian name of an early Seleucid prince (Apammu, son of Antiochus I) perhaps reflects dynastic policy, a need to acknowledge the Iranian in-laws of the Seleucids. A post-Seleucid instance of a Greek-named son of an Iranian-named ruler (Timotheos, son of Aspasinē; cf. Antiochus, son of Ar'abuzānā) surely reflects the "philhellenism" of rulers in the generation around the Arsacid conquest of Mesopotamia. Neither has implications for the status of the Iranian heritage in Babylonia itself.

On the other hand, Zadok sees the Babylonian spellings *Indupanē* and *Urudēsu* as Babylonian transcriptions of the Greek representations of underlying Middle Iranian names (Zadok 1997a; I would add *Aspasinē* as another example of the same phenomenon). If so, they are evidence that Greek was a vehicle for transmitting new Iranian names to Babylonians. At least for the writers of the Astronomical Diaries, and perhaps more generally, Greek had become the dominant extraneous language in Babylonia by the generation after the Arsacid conquest.<sup>24</sup>

<sup>23</sup> Oelsner 1991. There are fewer Greek names in the texts from Babylon than in the texts from Uruk. Some of them belong to men stationed in Babylon by the rulers, that is, men whose presence had nothing to do with acculturation (Boiy 2000:264).

<sup>24</sup> This might also explain other spellings of Iranian names in the Astronomical Diaries that depart from the orthographic conventions of Achaemenid Babylonian, notably transcriptions with final *-ā* (or other long vowel) where Old Iranian morphology would require another ending and Middle Iranian might have none (e.g., notably *Artabānā*, but cf. also *Ar'abuzānā*, *Bagajašā*, *Gutarzā*, *Ispubarzā*, *Mitrādātā*, *Piriustānā*, *Raznumitrā*, *Urudā*). This phenomenon is less common among Iranian names from legal and administrative texts, all earlier than the pertinent names in the Diaries (but note Mitrā [305 BC], Papā, Piritā [305 BC], Rēmā?). ➔ Pallis 1953:000 held that Timarchos,

When post-Achaemenid Babylonian texts use titles of Iranian origin to identify named individuals, in almost all cases the names of these individuals are Babylonian, and so are their patronyms and family names. This is true both of Seleucid and of Arsacid texts.

*ammarkaru*: Tanittu-Bēl/Bēl-bullissu; Aḫḫū'a/Enlil-šum-ušur//Mannu-Enlil-dari  
*ganzabarru*: Anu-ab-ušur; Mušallim-Anu  
*gardu 'a*: Kitu-Anu/Idat-Anu; Anu-mār-ittannu/Rihat-Anu//Anu-ah-ittannu  
*uppudētu*: Itti-Marduk-balātu/Bēl-aḫḫē-ušur//Mušēzib  
*zēnabarru*: Rihat-Nanâ/Ate'-<sup>d</sup>Bēl

The egregious exception is the explicitly Greek 'herald' Kalinikos (*Kallinuksu Ēmanaja azdākara*) of 314 BC.<sup>25</sup> This is a clear instance of a Greek occupying an Achaemenid position identified with an Iranian term in the generation of the Macedonian conquest. Unfortunately, it is the only such instance in the Babylonian texts, and we have no real knowledge of what the position was.

Conversely, the titles associated with Iranian personal names in post-Achaemenid texts, and both are expressed in outwardly Babylonian form:

*Aspastānu* LÚ.GAL *uqa*  
*Indaparnu* LÚ.NAM [...]  
*Mitradata* [LÚ.GAL *u*] *qānu*  
*Mitrātu* LÚ.GAL.GAL *uqa*  
*Urraḫšu* LÚ.GAL *uqa*

A possible exception is *Urudēsu* LÚ.GAL *ku-mar-ri ša bītāt ilāni*.

#### 4. Translation, Replacement, Coinage

Some commentators have interpreted titles in post-Achaemenid Iranian texts as translations, replacements or functional counterparts of Babylonian titles (as I have sometimes done above). These suggestions are based on the etymologies of the Iranian titles, on their collocation with other titles, or both. Some assume that the administrative structure of Babylonian temples was similar throughout Seleucid and Arsacid Mesopotamia. Some further assume that the structure of the upper levels of Babylonian temple administration was roughly the same as it had been since the time of Nabonidus, a combination of four entities: (1) a chief executive officer (e.g., *šatammu* or *šangû*), (2) a chief financial or administrative officer (e.g., *ṭupšar bīti*), (3) a representative of the crown (e.g., *qīpu* or *ša rēš šarri bēl piqitti*), and (4) consultative body of temple personnel (e.g., *kiništu*). For example:

---

Himeros, Hyspaosines are not true Greek names, but represent paronomasia operating on underlying Iranian names.

<sup>25</sup> And perhaps also Ḫūrā, the *dā[tabarru?]* in the reign of Alexander IV; but cf. Neo-Babylonian, Achaemenid Babylonian PN Ḫūru, Ḫurru.

McEwan 1981:34f., 64 proposed that the financial officer called *ganzabarru* in the temple organization at Uruk was the functional counterpart of the paymaster called *bēl mindē* in the temple at Babylon.<sup>26</sup>

McEwan 1981:27 proposed that the title *uppuḍētu ša bītāt ilāni* was the Persian equivalent (i.e., a partial translation) of Babylonian *paqdu ša bītāt ilāni*.<sup>27</sup> Van der Spek (1987:64, 1992:253) saw *uppuḍētu* as the functional counterpart of this title, but also of transcribed Greek titles, *prostatēs* (Babylonian *purruṣutattesu*) and *episkopos* (Babylonian *episkupusu*), in other texts.

Joannès 2000:169 proposed that the Greek *episkupusu* had replaced the defunct title *ša rēš šarri bēl piqitti* in labeling one of the uppermost officers of temple administration, and *ammarkaru* was a Persian equivalent of a defunct title for the chief temple scribe (presumably *ṭupšar bīti*, etc.).

We could also speculate about *dātabarru*: it appears in sequence between the *šatammu* of Esagil and the ‘Babylonians, general assembly of Esagil,’ so if it has a literal implication ‘bearer of a (royal or satrapal) commission,’ then perhaps it replaces the earlier *ša rēš šarri bēl piqitti*.

We would suppose *a priori* that titles expressed in an extraneous language are most likely to be connected with the third of the four listed administrative entities, that is, the one that has to do with the temples’ external connections to a government dominated by users of extraneous languages. Among the titles of Iranian origin, *ammarakaru* and *ganzabarru* probably do not conform to this supposition, but *dātabarru* might. *Uppuḍētu* certainly does, at least to the extent that holder of the title was sent from the temple to the palace. But since doing so took him off the temple’s payroll and put him on the palace’s, the title does not seem to fit comfortably into the general structure of temple administration. If we further suppose that the dominant extraneous language was Greek, then *ammarakaru* and *ganzabarru* can be seen as true loanwords that were no longer extraneous, and *uppuḍētu* (and perhaps *dātabarru*) can be seen as a reintroduction of Iranian terms under specific political circumstances, not as Achaemenid survivals.

The titles of the highest ranking men after the king who appear in our texts are not loanwords but coinages: *muma’iru* ‘satrap,’ and *rab uqu* (etc.) ‘general, generalissimo.’ Both preserve Achaemenid terms and usage, but the terms are Babylonian, not Iranian.

The Akkadian word *muma’iru* and the logogram LÚ.GAL UKKIN have pre-Achaemenid precedents, but this usage, referring to a provincial governor, does not. It first appears in an astronomical diary of 365 BC, late in the reign of Artaxerxes II.<sup>28</sup> Hence, if this usage represents a loan-translation, then the underlying term is Iranian (e.g. *frāmata’*), not Greek.

---

<sup>26</sup> If BM 132290, mentioning the title of a *ganzabarru*, comes from Babylon, it does not exclude this proposal (as implied in Stolper 1985); this *ganzabarru* is probably not a temple administrator at all.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. the critical remark of Kuhrt 1983:282.

<sup>28</sup> In the abstract *muma’irūtu* (wr. *mu-ma-’ir-ū-tu*), ‘governorship’: Sachs-Hunger Diaries –366 A ii 8.

The title *rab uqu* is post-Achaemenid. Its early use as the title of Antigonus in date formulas<sup>29</sup> supports the consensus that it represents a Greek title, *stratēgos*. Yet this early use also suggests that the title was already understood at the time of the Macedonian conquest. The basis on which it was formed, the word *uqu* for ‘army,’ ‘people,’ or ‘personnel,’ is Achaemenid. The word *uqu* occurs only once in a pre-Achaemenid Babylonian, and otherwise only in the Babylonian version of the Bisitun inscription of Darius (as the regular counterpart of OP *kāra-*, Aramaic *ḥyl* ’), and in Achaemenid Babylonian legal and administrative texts.<sup>30</sup> It is likely that *rab uqu* is also an Achaemenid coinage. If it was a loan-translation, no obvious candidate for an underlying Iranian term is extant.<sup>31</sup>

Both titles, then, ‘satrap’ and ‘general,’ are arguably survivals of Achaemenid usage, but in Babylonian, not Iranian form.

## 5. In Conclusion

Etymology is a poor basis for history. This small sample of names and titles supports impressions rather than inferences, generalizations or even a “balance sheet.”

Common sense requires us to suppose first that there are few Iranian words and names in post-Achaemenid cuneiform texts because there are fewer cuneiform texts and they are of fewer kinds. Accidents of preservation and discovery may explain why there are fewer texts. The increasing use of Aramaic or Greek recording instead of cuneiform recording may explain in part why there are fewer kinds of texts (e.g. Joannès 2001: 379, and especially Doty 1977).<sup>32</sup>

This attenuation of the stream of cuneiform recording as we have it seems to begin before the Macedonian conquest, perhaps in the early fourth century. The conquest does not make a distinct break in the record as we have it, for groups of Seleucid literary, learned, legal and administrative texts, both from Uruk and from Babylon, include Achaemenid

<sup>29</sup> LÚ.GAL *ú-qu*, e.g., CT 49 35-41, 43f., 46, 49, AION Suppl. 77 87; LÚ.GAL *ú-qa*), e.g., BM 67431; LÚ.GAL ERÍN, e.g., CT 44 84, AION Suppl. 77 81, *ibid.* 83; LÚ.GAL ERÍN KUR.KUR, e.g., CT 49 34. But in Arsacid use, *rab uqu* is distinguished from LÚ.GAL.ERÍN<sup>ni</sup>.MEŠ = *rab ummāni*—see below, s.v. Urrahšu.

<sup>30</sup> See Zadok 1981:659 with n. 6, suggesting a possible West Semitic source. Jeremy Black (personal communication) contemplated a possible Elamite source. In Achaemenid Babylonian texts, *uqu* is not restricted to workers or soldiers connected with institutions of Achaemenid rule: e.g. *uqu ša gugallī* (see Jursa 1995:182 No. 65:5f., cf. *ibid.* 36); *uqu epinni*, ‘plowing team’ (Dar. 533:17, 19f.; FuB 14 11 No. 1:3 [coll.]).

<sup>31</sup> An inviting counterpart is Greek *karanos*, the title held by Cyrus the Younger in Anatolia, which reappears in Aramaic transcription on Parthian coins; Briant 1996:1006; Keen 1998.

<sup>32</sup> If so, the assumed greater convenience of Greek or Aramaic—an assumption that I find simplistic and unpersuasive—cannot be a significant cause, and changes in training cannot be the only cause, since the literary and scientific collections prove that a very high order of cuneiform literary instruction was available.

items. Some scribes of learned texts and some parties to contracts belonged to families that can be traced back to Achaemenid or pre-Achaemenid times.

The Uruk legal texts in particular represent families and a social fabric that were already established in late Achaemenid reigns, as Oelsner (e.g., 1978:103; 1981:44) and others have commented. Iranians were not a recognizable part of this fabric. Iranian personal names are absent from late Achaemenid texts from Uruk (e.g., Stolper 1990), and they remain absent from post-Achaemenid texts. This perspective makes the appearance of Greek names in texts from Uruk a striking phenomenon.<sup>33</sup> The Greek presence left a mark in the record in a way that Achaemenid rule did not. The absence of Iranian names may therefore not be a mere accident of the sample. If the families were not changed, the reasons for the difference lay more on the Greek side than on the Babylonian side. In a similar vein, Oelsner inferred from records of slaves dedicated to Babylonian temples by people with Greek names and Greek-named ancestors, at Uruk and at Cutha or Seleucia, that

[i]m hellenistischen Babylonien erfolgte nicht nur eine Hellenisierung bestimmter Bevölkerungskreise, sondern umgekehrt übte auch die einheimische Kultur bis zu einem gewissen Grad eine Anziehungskraft auf die Zuwanderer aus, also ein wechselseitiges Geben und Nehmen (Oelsner 1992:344; cf. Oelsner 1995:122f.)

Bearers of Babylonian cultural continuity were Babylonians, participants in it and bearers of change were Greek, but identifiable Iranians are absent from view. We may surmise that in Uruk, at least, about a hundred years after the Macedonian conquest, Hellenistic rule began to promote such social interaction, acculturation and/or political opportunism in a way Achaemenid rule had not done, or at least among groups that Achaemenid rule had not reached.

This perspective also makes the appearance of the Iranian title *ganzabarru* in Hellenistic Uruk more striking, giving a little force to the suggestion made above, that the does not represent the persistence of an Achaemenid office at Uruk, but the extension of an Achaemenid title under the aegis of a Hellenistic administration.<sup>34</sup>

The material from Babylon and its vicinity makes an opposite impression. Unlike the Uruk texts, few of the Babylon texts come from family archives; even so, the example of the astrologer and *uppuḍētu*, Itti-Marduk-balāṭu/Mušēzib, suggests that some of the parties to these documents belong to a long-established Babylonian elite. Iranian names are well-attested in Achaemenid texts from the region of Babylon, and a few Iranian names are still attested in the post-Achaemenid texts. More titles of Iranian origin appear in post-Achaemenid texts from Babylon and nearby than in texts from Uruk, but Greek names are much scarcer (Boiy 2000:264). In legal and administrative texts from the region of Babylon, all the Iranian names and all but one of the Iranian titles come from

---

<sup>33</sup> Greek names become common in Uruk texts about two generations after the Macedonian conquest, after the mid-third century BC: see Oelsner 1992:341, citing Sarkisjan 1974.

<sup>34</sup> The same speculation would apply to *garduja*.

the first century after the conquest.<sup>35</sup> In most cases, the Babylonian transcriptions are close renderings of the presumed underlying Old Iranian forms.<sup>36</sup> On grounds of distribution and form, these must represent the survival of an Iranian or Iranized population segment, and some Iranian administrative functions. These Iranized Babylonians survived in circumstances mostly impervious to Greeks. When they disappear from the record, Greeks do not appear in their places.<sup>37</sup>

With all the uncertainties of such a small and narrow sample, these texts suggest that Iranian names faded away, rather than being preserved in the Babylonian onomasticon. With equal uncertainty, the Astronomical Diaries suggest that by the time the Arsacids took over Babylonia, Iranian names may have become strange enough to learned scribes that they recorded forms of the names transmitted through Greek or Aramaic.

Broadly speaking, although the distribution of the Iranica in post-Achaemenid Babylonian texts conforms to our general suppositions about the transition from Achaemenid to Seleucid and eventually to Parthian rule, the Iranica are a disappointing source of information about it. As expected, Iranian names and titles are concentrated in the first post-Achaemenid century. The Babylonian populations portrayed in our texts did not include an identifiable portion of Iranian origin, and the texts show no social interaction between established Irano-Babylonians and newly arrived Greco-Babylonians. That some of the Iranian common nouns also survived in other languages and territories (e.g., *aḥšadrapānu*, *ganzabarru*, *databarru*, *ammarkarru*), that some are hitherto attested only as survivals without Achaemenid Babylonian parallels (*azdakāra*, *zēnabarru*), and that some appear in new contexts, are unparalleled in Achaemenid Babylonian texts—all this suggests that the presence of Iranian political and administrative terminology was more widespread and more ingrained in Babylonia than Achaemenid Babylonian records alone would imply, and from the point of view of the rulers some of these terms were loanwords, as much a part of Babylonian language as the Achaemenid coinages for ‘satrap’ and ‘general.’ Nevertheless, these words belonged among the instruments of control, a part of the Achaemenid inheritance that was not so much embedded in Babylonian society as transmitted from one group of rulers to the next, then adapted to changing political conditions.

---

<sup>35</sup> Names—earliest: *Bagabartu*/*Bagamastu* (patronym), *Nabarzānu*, both 328 BC; latest: *Pāpā* and *Piršīna*’ (patronym), both 239 BC. Titles—earliest: *azdakāra* (314 BC), *ganzabarru*; latest *zēnabarru* (270 BC), *uppuḍētu* (127 BC).

<sup>36</sup> Exception: *Artāšari*’ < \**Rta-čāra*-.

<sup>37</sup> Judging from the indexes of Boiy 2000, personal names of West Semitic origin also seem to be surprisingly uncommon in post-Achaemenid texts from Babylon (the counterexample of Raḥimesu notwithstanding).

Appendix:  
Iranica in Post-Achaemenid Babylonian Texts  
(Items marked with <sup>ACH</sup> are also attested in Achaemenid Babylonian texts.)

1. Common Nouns

*abistātu* (in *bīt abistātu*)<sup>38</sup>

Babylon

SE 50-59 = 262-252 BC

(letter-order from *šatammu* of Esagil): (silver) <sup>(5)</sup> *ultu kasap sūti ša É a-bi-is-ta-tu* (...)] <sup>(6)</sup> *ša PN u PN<sub>2</sub>* <sup>(7)</sup> ... *ana* ITI.KIN *u* ITI.ŠE MU.50.KÁM *ša ina pānika ana kurummāt* LÚ.U+MUG.MEŠ ... *idin* CT 49 118:5 (SE 50); see McEwan 1981:133.

(letter order from *šatammu*): (silver) *ultu kasap sūti* GIŠ.BAR <sup>(6)</sup> *ša É a-bi-is-ta-tu* <sup>(7)</sup> *ša PN* <sup>(8)</sup> *ana kurummāt išparī* ... *idin* CT 49 128:6 (SE 59)

(damaged letter order?, from LÚ.UKKIN *šá* ... to LÚ.EN *mindu ša* LÚ.ŠID.U<sub>4</sub> A[N <sup>d</sup>EN.LÍL]; damaged context) ... *kurummāsu* [...] <sup>(7)</sup> *É a-bi-is-ta-tu* ... <sup>(8)</sup> *ana kurummāt* LÚ [...] CT 49 181:6 (no preserved date).

Cf. also (silver) *qalû epšu ša Antikusu ša PN ina muḫḫi PN<sub>2</sub> ina ūmu* ... *ša kaspi šá É a-...-ta-tu* BM 32225 (Babylon, SE 56).

<sup>ACH</sup>*aḫšadrapānu*<sup>39</sup> (\*xšaθra-pāna-) ‘satrap’

Uruk

After SE 124 = <128 BC

(sale of ration rights) *ūmu mala* PN (buyer) *šuātu šebû* PN<sub>2</sub> (seller) [...] *iqabbi ina pa-ni* LÚ ŠEŠ-*šá-da-ra-ba-an-nu umma kurummātu* [...] *šá* PN *šuāti* [*šina?*] BRM 2 56:19.<sup>40</sup>

= Achaemenid Babylonian *aḫšadrapānu*<sup>41</sup>

<sup>ACH</sup>*ammarkaru* (*hamarakara*, etc.) (\*hamāarakara-)<sup>42</sup> ‘bookkeeper, accountant’

Babylon SE 32 = 280 BC

Nippur SE 158 = 154 BC

<sup>(10)</sup> *Tanittu-dBēl* LÚ *am<sup>?</sup>-ma-ár<sup>?</sup>-k[a<sup>?</sup>-al<sup>?</sup>]* <sup>(11)</sup> A <sup>md</sup>*Bēl-bullissu* (first witness in record of deposit of silver) CT 49 103:10; see AION Suppl. 77 No. 5 (Babylon, SE 32).<sup>43</sup>

<sup>38</sup> McEwan 1981:133; Boiy 2000:102. Zadok 1983:217--\*abi-stāta- (Middle Persian *awestād*, Modern Persian *ostād*), ‘master’. Butz apud Van der Spek 1985:556—\*avi-stata- ‘Anbau, Überbau’. Otherwise von Soden 1982:295—Greek *epistates*; similarly Joannès 2000:173; but Zadok’s strictures (loc. cit.) against Babylonian *a-bi-* as a representation of Greek *epi-* are convincing.. And cf. \*abistāvana ‘Kronland?’: Hinz 1975:18.

<sup>39</sup> McEwan 1981:63, 139. Cf. Tavernier 2002: 701.

<sup>40</sup> Parallel: *ina ūmu gabbi ša* PN (buyer = seller in BRM 2 56) *šebû illakū u iqabbû* PN<sub>2</sub> *u* PN<sub>3</sub> (sellers) *ina pāni man-am gabbi ša* PN *šebû umma* SAR.MEŠ PAD.ḪI.A *šuāti ina šumi* PN whenever PN wishes PN<sub>2</sub> and PN<sub>3</sub> will come and declare in the presence of anyone PN wishes ‘the documents of these rations are in the name of PN’ BRM 2 33:14ff. (SE 124, a sale of the same ration rights).

<sup>41</sup> See Tavernier 2002:701. three times in Murašû, once in ROMCT 2 48 (all Nippur).

<sup>42</sup> Boiy 2000: 204.



<sup>m</sup>A<sup>h</sup>hū 'a LÚ *am-mar-a-ka-lu* LÚ NU.ÈŠ <sup>d</sup>EN.LÍ[L A šá <sup>md</sup>Enlil-šum-uš]ur A <sup>m</sup>Mannu-  
<sup>d</sup>Enlil-dari Van der Spek 1992:257:3 and seal caption (1e.ed.)—after šatammu  
 and episkopos (Nippur 158 SE).  
 = Achaemenid Babylonian *ammarkaru*, *ammaru akal*.<sup>44</sup>

*apadāna* (\*apadāna-) 'Apadana (building)'

Babylon

SE 225 = 87 BC

[... š]á UGU É **ap-pa-dan** *ina* URU *Se-lu-ke-'a* "which is above the *apadāna* in  
 Seleucia' Sachs-Hunger Diaries –86 B Flake 11' (see Del Monte 1997:273).  
 = Achaemenid Akkadian *appadānu* (only in A<sup>2</sup>Sa).

<sup>ACH</sup>*ardabu* (\*rdba-) 'artabe(-measure)'

Borsippa<sup>745</sup>

Early Hellenistic (329 BC and after)

x dates *ina* **ar-da-[bi ...]** ... *liddinū* CT 49 36:4; x dates *ina* GIŠ **ar-da-bi** ša Nabû  
 ... *liddinū* CT 49 40:6; also 42:3; 43:5; 56:5; 62:5; 63:5 (damaged); 68:5; 83:4;  
 89:5; 90:4; 91:5; 93:4; 97:4; dates *ina* *ar-da-bu* ša NÍG.GA *ana* PN ... *liddinū* CT  
 49 61:4; x dates *ina* GIŠ *ar-da-bi* ša Nabû PN *ana muḥḥi* PN<sub>2</sub> etc. CT 49 46:1  
 (promissory note parallel to letter-orders); dates ša *mušanê* *ina* GIŠ *ar-da-bu*  
 Kessler 2000:214 No. 1:4 (year 8 Alexander III = 329 BC); dates *ina* *ar-da-bi*  
 Kessler 2000:216 No. 4:4 (undated), *ibid.* 217 No. 6:4 (Antigonos or Alexander  
 IV) (all letter-orders; Brewer's Archive; Nabû temple).

x barley [...] **ar-da-bu** *ana* PN ... *liddinū* CT 49 54:4; x barley *ina* *ar-da-bi* CT 49  
 65:4, also 67:5, 77:4, 83:4, 85:4 (cf. 64:3f., 66:3f., barley *ina* GIŠ.BAR ša  
*kuruppu*).

= Achaemenid Babylonian *ardabu*.<sup>46</sup>

Exactly parallel to *mašīḥu* ša Nabû, GIŠ *ma-ši-ḥu* ša *kuruppu* etc. in  
 similar letter orders.

*azdākara* (\*azdākara-) 'herald'

Babylon

Antigonos year 4 = 314 BC

(receipt for silver disbursed from *makkūr Bēl* on orders of)

(<sup>4</sup>) <sup>m</sup>*Ka-li-nu-uk-su* LÚ *e-ma-na-a-a* (<sup>5</sup>) LÚ **az-da-kar-ri** AION Suppl. 77 A2-7:5.

= Achaemenid \**azdākara*-, not attested in Achaemenid Babylonian.

<sup>ACH</sup>*dātabarru* (\*dātabara-)<sup>47</sup> 'law officer, judge'

Babylon

SE 66 = 246 B.C.

<sup>43</sup> Same person in CT 105:13 and left edge (Stolper AION Suppl. 77 No. 6)—first  
 witness, without title.

<sup>44</sup> Tavernier 2002:691, with extensive literature. All cited Babylonian occurrences in  
 Murašû texts except ROMCT 2 35:21 (Nippur) and Eilers Beamtennamen pl. 2:4 (place  
 not preserved); VAT 15613:12(?) (place not preserved).

<sup>45</sup> Oelsner 1986:225.

<sup>46</sup> Tavernier 2002:675f. Camb. 316 and JCS 53 113 No. 12:7 (Nippur, Artaxerxes)] only.

<sup>47</sup> Boiy 2000:148, 191, 208; Van der Spek 1993:101; Del Monte 1997:47.

(Oldest son of Antiochus, and *šatammu* of Esagil, and) LÚ **da-ta-b[ar-ra ... LÚ.]**  
E.KI.MEŠ *kiništu Esagil* (in connection with a festival): Diaries –245B Obv. 4  
(see Del Monte 1997:47).<sup>48</sup>

Perhaps <sup>m</sup>*Hu-ra-a* LÚ **da-** ... A <sup>md</sup>EN-MU-MU, witness in ZA 3 148f. (Alexander IV),  
coll. Kennedy.

= Achaemenid Babylonian *dātabarru*.<sup>49</sup>

<sup>ACH</sup>*dātu* (dāta-)

Babylon

SE ≤ 24, 94, 118 = 288/87 or earlier, 218, 194 BC

(Babylon?)

(if he does not repay the barley at the specified term, he will repay double the amount) <sup>(7)</sup> *kī ana šanû la ittannu libbû da-[a]-tû* <sup>(8)</sup> [*in*]andin if he does not repay double the amount, he will repay according to the edict CT 49 34:7; See Stolper AION Suppl. 77 51 No. 17.

(record of deposit of silver) *kī ina adannišu la utirri PN la ittannu libbû da-a-tû ša šarri ša ana muḥḥi paqdu šaṭri inamdin* ZA 3 150 No. 13:9; see AION Suppl. 77 29f. No. 9; Oelsner 1995:143.

(deposited silver) *libbû da-a-ta ... innisiri* CT 49 173:11; see Stolper AION Suppl. 77 25f. No. 8 (no preserved date).

<sup>(27)</sup> [ ... ] <sup>(28)</sup> LÚ *ia-a-nu* <sup>(29)</sup> **da-a-tum** *ša šarri ušēpiš u tēlīt ša maḥīri* [ ... ] <sup>(30)</sup>  
PN (buyer) *ultu bītišu inam[din]* CT 49 137:29 (SE 118; broken context at end of sale of real estate).

= Achaemenid Babylonian *dātu*.<sup>50</sup>

<sup>ACH</sup>*ganzabarru*<sup>51</sup> (\*ganzabara-) ‘treasurer, treasury worker?’

Uruk, [Babylon]

Early Hellenistic-SE 157 = 155 BC

Anu-ab-ušur LÚ **ga-an-za-ba-ri** šá É.DINGIR.MEŠ. (after *paqdu ša Uruk*) (among officials before whom a dispute over a temple prebend has been heard) OECT 9 42:8 (Uruk, after SE 103).

Mušallim-Anu ša *ultu* LÚ **gan-zu-bar-ra** MEŠ ša É DINGIR.MEŠ (principal in a prebend lease) OECT 9 62:3 (Uruk, SE 157).

*ušrû ša* [PN] LÚ **ganzabarri** BM 132290:4 ([Babylon?], Alexander III or IV).<sup>52</sup>  
= Achaemenid Babylonian *ganzabarru*.<sup>53</sup>

<sup>ACH</sup>*gardu* <sup>a</sup>?<sup>54</sup> (\*gṛda-, with Aram. gentilic?)

Uruk

SE 152-154 = 160-157 BC

<sup>48</sup> Van der Spek 1993:101; Boiy 2000:191 and 208.

<sup>49</sup> Tavernier 2002:686:11 occurrences in Murašû texts, ZA 5 279 (Kasr; coll. Dandamayev), and BM 30136 (Zadok 1976, coll.; Nippur?)

<sup>50</sup> Tavernier 2002:380: four occurrences, Babylon, Borsippa and Ur, all reign of Darius I.

<sup>51</sup> McEwan 1981: 34f., 64; Stolper 2000.

<sup>52</sup> Boiy 2000:28; Stolper 1993:85; Jursa 1998 74 n. 270.

<sup>53</sup> Tavernier 2002:689; Stolper 2000. Twice in Egibi texts from Babylon, reign of Darius I.

<sup>54</sup> McEwan 1981: 61.

Kitu-Anu/Idat-Anu LÚ **ga-ar-ṽdu-ú<sup>1</sup>-a** (witness) BRM 2 41:39 1(52 SE)  
 Anu-mār-ittannu/Riḥat-Anu//Anu-aḥ-ittannu LÚ **ga-ar-ṽdu-ú<sup>1</sup>-a** (seller) BRM 2  
 44:27. (154 SE)  
 Probably = Achaemenid *gardu*.<sup>55</sup>

<sup>ACH</sup>*uppadētu*<sup>56</sup> (\*upadaiti-?) ‘overseer?’

Babylon

SE 185? = 127 BC.

Itti-Marduk-balāṭu/Bēl-aḥḥē-uṣur//Mušēzib LÚ.GAL.DÙ šá UGU URU LÚ **up-pu-de-e-  
 tú** šá É.MEŠ DINGIR.MEŠ *ṭupšar Enūma-Anu-Enlil* BOR 4 132:10  
 (Hyspaosines).<sup>57</sup>  
 = Achaemenid Babylonian *uppadētu* (*appadētu*).<sup>58</sup>

*zēnabarra*<sup>59</sup> (\*zaina-bara-) ‘weaponbearer, armorer?’

Babylon.

SE 42 = 270 BC

(promissory note for beer *ša nadû šá* É DINGIR.MEŠ *šá ina qāt PN ina muḥḥi* <sup>m</sup>*Rihat-Nanâ* LÚ **zi-na-bar-ra** A <sup>m</sup>*A-te* <sup>2</sup>*ḏBēl* (and his wife; his sons are to pay silver equivalent; if not, interest accrues) CT 49 111:3 = AION Suppl. 77 No. 13.

## 2. Personal Names

<sup>ACH</sup>*Apammu* (\*Apamā-, Apames)

Babylon

SE 66 = 246 B.C.

[<sup>m</sup>S]*iluku* <sup>m</sup>*Anti* <sup>ṽ</sup>*ukusu u* <sup>m</sup>**A-pa-am-mu** DUMU.MEŠ-šú Sachs-Hunger Diaries –245 A  
 13 (see Del Monte 1997:46; Zadok 2002 with bibliography).  
 = Achaemenid Babylonian <sup>f</sup>*Appamū* (Zadok 2002, 20).

*Ar* <sup>ṽ</sup>*abuzānā* (\*Arya-baujāna-)<sup>60</sup>

Babylon

SE 167?-171 = 145?-141 B.C.

<sup>55</sup> Tavernier 2002:690. On Babylonian spellings of Akkadian titles with *-ia*, probably representing Aramaic plural forms, see Stolper 1985:142, and cf. Rosenthal 1995 §§58, 189.

<sup>56</sup> McEwan 1981: 27; Boiy 2000:202; Van der Spek 1985:554, 1987:64.

<sup>57</sup> See Oelsner 2000: 802-811, reconstructing a family of scholars through at least seven generations, with ancestors in sixth century BC: “Die Urkunde [BOR 4 132] zeigt zugleich, dass Itti-Marduk-balāṭu nicht nur—wie auch seine Söhne—Kultsänger (*kalû*) und ‘Sternkundiger’ war, sondern zugleich auch hoher städtischer Funktionär” (Oelsner 2000:807).

<sup>58</sup> Tavernier 2002:697: 6 occurrences, reigns of Cambyses and Darius. Cf. Parthian <sup>ṽ</sup>*wpdyt*, apparently the name of a satrap: Schmitt 1998:170, 193 sub I.20. On BOR 4 132, see also Van der Spek 1985:549f.

<sup>59</sup> McEwan 1981:62; von Soden 1982:95; Stolper 1985:142; Dandamayev 1993.

<sup>60</sup> Zadok 1997a No. 11; Schmitt 1998:183; cf. Tavernier 2002:433.

Antiochos, son of <sup>m</sup>**Ar-<sup>ʔ</sup>-a-bu-za-na-a** ... [...] Sachs-Hunger Diaries -140 A rev. 7 (SE 171, see Van der Spek 1997/1998:171. Del Monte 1997:103).  
 Perhaps = <sup>m</sup>**A-ri-<sup>ʔ</sup>-a-bu(-)x** [...] *x ana Bābili u nārāti šanēti* KU<sub>4</sub>.MEŠ-ni “(that month I heard): Ari’ab-(x) [ ... ], they entered Babylon and its other rivers”  
 Sachs-Hunger Diaries -144 B obv. 16’ (SE 167 see Del Monte 1997:95).<sup>61</sup>

<sup>ACH</sup>*Artabānā* (\**Ṛta-bānu-š*)<sup>62</sup>

Babylon

SE 193 = 119 B.C.

(against the son of the king and the troops of the cities of Gutium, who had killed)

<sup>m</sup>**Ar-ta-ba-na-a** *šEŠ-ia* ‘my (i.e. king Mithridates II’s) brother Artabanus (= Artabanus II).’ Sachs-Hunger Diaries -118A ‘rev.’ 20 (see Del Monte 1997:149f.; Van der Spek 2001:43f.).

= Achaemenid Babylonian *Artabānu*.<sup>63</sup>

*Artašari*<sup>ʔ</sup> (\**Ṛta-čāra-*)<sup>64</sup>

Babylon

SE 37 = 275 BC

<sup>m</sup>**Ar-ta-šá-ri-<sup>ʔ</sup>** CT 49 107+BM 32170:5 (in broken context).

*Asi ʔabaṭar*<sup>ʔ</sup> (\**Āsya-paṭra-ʔ*)

Babylon

SE 221-222 = 90-89 BC

<sup>m</sup>*Aršaka šarru ša ṭarridu* [<sup>m</sup>*Gu-ṭ*]*a-ár-za u* <sup>f</sup>**A-si-<sup>ʔ</sup>-a-ba-ṭa-ar** *šá* AD LÚ UŠ A DAM-šú  
 SBH 51+ (see Del Monte 1997:251, with previous literature)

<sup>m</sup>*Aršakā ša i*<sup>!ʔ</sup>-ṭ[*ár-ʔ-ri-du*] <sup>m</sup>*Gu-tár-za-a* LUGAL ù <sup>f</sup>**A-si-i-ba-ṭ**[**a**<sup>ʔ</sup>-**ar**<sup>ʔ</sup>] DAM-šú  
 GAŠAN ZA 6 230:4 (see Oelsner 1986 276f.; Van der Spek 2000: 441).

<sup>ACH</sup>*Aspasinē* [=Hyspaosines] (\**Aspa-činā- ~ \*Huvaspa-činā-ʔ*)<sup>65</sup>

Babylon

SE 187-185 = 125-123 BC

<sup>m</sup>**As-pa-si-ni-e** LUGAL BOR 4 132:5, 6 (Babylon, SE 185)

(Ṭimarkusu, who previously from the side of king Arsaces was appointed guard commander, and who in month IV) <sup>m</sup>**As-pa-si-ni-e** *išḫiṭi* TA DA <sup>m</sup>*In-du-pa-né-e* KI LÚ.ERÍN.MEŠ KUR *Ma-da-a-a* GIN.MEŠ *ana* E.KI KU<sub>4</sub>.MEŠ had escaped from Aspasinē, came from the side of Indupanē with troops of Media; they entered Babylon Diaries -126 A Obv. 8.

<sup>61</sup> Zadok 1997a No. 10 suggests a different name, *Ari ʔapu*, perhaps Iranian \**Arya-pā-*.

<sup>62</sup> Zadok 1997a No. 12.

<sup>63</sup> Tavernier 2002:559. Otherwise: \**Ṛta-pāna-*, not attested in Achaemenid Babylonian (Achaemenid Elamite Irdabana; Parthian *ʔrtpn*; see Tavernier 2002:564; Schmitt 1998:179),

<sup>64</sup> Boiy 2000:294 sub 70.

<sup>65</sup> Zadok 1997a ad No. 19. Cf. Ἀσπαθινῆς in Herodotus, corresponding to OP *Aspačanah* in DB; and perhaps Ἀσπασιανός in Polybius (Justi 1895:46).

Also <sup>m</sup>**As-pa-si-ni-e** Sachs-Hunger Diaries -125 Obv. 20, -124B ‘rev.’ 12’, 15’;  
<sup>m</sup>**As-pa-si-ni-e** LUGAL A.MEŠ *šá-nu-ú* Sachs-Hunger Diaries -124B ‘rev.’ 12’, -  
123A obv. 18’, 20’.

*Ti-<sup>2</sup>-mu-ú-tu-su* A *šá* <sup>m</sup>**As-pa-a-si-ni-e** Sachs-Hunger Diaries -124B ‘obv.’ 5’= SE  
187 = BC 125.  
= Achaemenid Babylonian Aspašina.<sup>66</sup>

*Aspastanu* (\*Aspa-stāna-)<sup>67</sup>

Babylon

SE 224 = 88 BC

<sup>m</sup>**As-pa-as-ta-nu** LÚ.GAL *ú-qa* ‘Aspastanu, the general’ Sachs-Hunger Diaries -87 C  
rev. 32’ (see Del Monte 1997:172; Van der Spek 2001:455).

<sup>ACH</sup>*Bagajašā* (\*Bagaiča-?)<sup>68</sup>

Babylon

SE 177-192 = 135-120 BC

KUŠ.*šatar*.MEŠ *šá šarri šá munnû šá* <sup>m</sup>**Ba-a-ga-a-a-šá**-[a...] ‘leather documents of the  
king concerning the appointing of Bagajaša’ Sachs-Hunger Diaries -134 obv. 16  
(135 BC).

(that month I heard as follows: Pilinus, the general of Babyonia who is above the four  
generals) *šá ina* ITL.BAR *ana alāni ša* KUR *Madaja ana maḥar* <sup>m</sup>**Ba-a-ga-a-a-šá**-  
**a aḫi šarri illik-ma al-<sup>1</sup>te<sup>2</sup>l-[e<sup>2</sup>] who in month I had gone to the cities of Media  
before Bagajaša, the brother of the king, and ... (= I heard as follows)’ Sachs-  
Hunger Diaries -132 rev. 22 (*al-te-e* restored from line 21).**

[...] *-x-na-a A ša* <sup>m</sup>**Ba-ga-a-a-<sup>2</sup>šá** *ša ana muḫḫi* 4 LÚ.GAL ERÍN-ni.MEŠ *ù* <sup>m</sup>*Ur-ra-aḫ-  
šú<sup>2</sup> rab ú-qu* [...] *na*, the son of Bagaya’aša who was above the 4 generals, and  
Urraḫšú, the general Sachs-Hunger Diaries-119 C obv. 12.

=Achaemenid Babylonian *Bagaiššu*, *Bagēšu* or *Bagaiāzu*, *Bage’azu* (\*Bagayāza-  
)?<sup>69</sup>

*Bagamasta* (\*Baga-masta-)

or: *Bagabarta* (\*Bagabrta-)<sup>70</sup>

Babylon

Alexander III year 9 = 328 B.C.

(receipt for silver)] *ušrû ša* <sup>m</sup>[...] A <sup>m</sup>**Ba-ga-BAR-ta** CT 49 5:2

*Gūpāru* (\*Gau-pāru-š)<sup>71</sup>

Babylon

SE 59 = 253 BC

<sup>m</sup>*Bēl*(UMUN)-*ḫa-ti-ni-<sup>2</sup> A-šú šá* <sup>m</sup>*Gu-pa-ru* BM 33657:6 (witness, promissory note).

<sup>66</sup> Tavernier 2002:409; once (Babylon, Darius I year 12).

<sup>67</sup> Cf. Achaemenid Aramaic *’spstn*; Zadok 1997a No. 13; Tavernier 2002:410.

<sup>68</sup> Zadok 1997a No. 14.

<sup>69</sup> Tavernier 2002:422, 430.

<sup>70</sup> Boiy 2000:295 sub 95; Tavernier 2002:419.

<sup>71</sup> Boiy 2000:323 sub 1596; Tavernier 2002:471.

*Gūtartzā* (Gōtarz, \*Gau-tarza-)<sup>72</sup>

Babylon

SE 221-225= 90-86 B.C.

*Aršakā* LUGAL [*ša iṭṭa*]rriḍu <sup>m</sup>**Gu-tar-za-a** LUGAL Sachs-Hunger Diaries –90 lower edge 1 (see Del Monte 1997:168).

[*ša iṭ*]tarriḍu <sup>m</sup>**Gu-tar-za** LUGAL [who] is called? king Gotarzes' Sachs-Hunger Diaries–88 upper edge 2.

<sup>m</sup>Ar-šá-ka LUGAL šá šumšú <sup>m</sup>**Gu-tár-za** Sachs-Hunger Diaries–87C rev. 31'.

[*Aršaka* LUGAL] <sup>r</sup>šá<sup>1</sup> iṭṭarid[u <sup>m</sup>**Gu-tár-za-(a)** LUGAL] Kessler 2000: 223 No. 17:[3] (SE 221 = 90 BC).

<sup>m</sup>Aršaka šarru ša iṭṭarriḍu <sup>m</sup>**Gu-tár-za-a** LUGAL u <sup>f</sup>A-si-i-ba-ṭár? GAŠAN LBAT 1295:000 (see Del Monte 1997:254).

<sup>m</sup>Aršaka šarru ša ṭarriḍu [<sup>m</sup>**Gu-ṭ**]a-ár-za u <sup>f</sup>A-si-<sup>2</sup>-a-ba-ṭa-ar šá AD LÚ UŠ A DAM-šú SBH 51+ (see Del Monte 1997:251, with previous literature)

<sup>m</sup>Aršakā ša i<sup>1</sup>?-ṭ[ár<sup>2</sup>-ri-du] <sup>m</sup>**Gu-tár-za-a** LUGAL ù <sup>f</sup>A-si-i-ba-ṭ[a<sup>2</sup>-ar?] DAM-šú GAŠAN ZA 6 230:4 (see Van der Spek 2000: 441).<sup>73</sup>

<sup>ACH</sup>*Indaparnu*<sup>74</sup> (Vindafārnah-?)

(Babylon?)

308/07 B.C.

*Italimatu pāḫātu ša bīt šarri Bābili ar*]ad ša <sup>m</sup>**In-da-par-nu** LÚ.NAM [...] <sup>(7)</sup> [...] -ga-áš-tum Ker Porter Travels II pl. 77g:6.<sup>75</sup>

In addition to DB Bab., also Achaemenid Babylonian *Undaparna*?, see Waerzeggers apud Tavernier 2002:369.

*Indupanē* (Vindafārnah-?)<sup>76</sup>

(Babylon)

SE 185 = 127 BC

<sup>m</sup>Aspasinē išḫiṭi ultu tēḫi <sup>m</sup>**In-du-pa-né-e** itti LÚ.ERÍN.MEŠ KUR *Mādaja* GIN.MEŠ ana E.KI KU<sub>4</sub>.MEŠ (Timarchos, who previously from the side of king Arsaces was appointed guard commander, and who in month IV) had escaped from Aspasinē, came from the side of Indupanē with troops of Media; they entered Babylon” Sachs-Hunger Diaries –126 A Obv. 8.

<sup>f</sup>*Ispubarzā* (\*Vispa-brz-?)

(Babylon)

SE 232-238 = 80-74 BC

MU.2.ME-34.KÁM <sup>m</sup>Ar-šá-ka-a LUGAL u <sup>f</sup>**I[s-pu-bar-za-a]** NIN-šú GAŠAN] “(year 170), which is year 234, Arsaces king and I[spubarza, his sister, queen]” Sachs-Hunger Diaries –77A left edge 1 (restored from LBAT 1162+1163 r. 10).

<sup>f</sup>**Is-pu-bar-za-a** NIN-su [GAŠAN] Sachs-Hunger Diaries –75 rev. 9' and up. ed. 1.

<sup>72</sup> Parthian *gwtrz*: Schmitt 1998:190.

<sup>73</sup> See Del Monte 1997: 251ff.; Van der Spek 2000:441.

<sup>74</sup> Boiy 2000:204. Cf. Schmitt 1998:184.

<sup>75</sup> Van der Spek 1986:202ff.; 1987: 63;1995:238ff. Text 9.

<sup>76</sup> Zadok 1997a No. 19: “seems to originate from *Vinda-farnah*,” via a Greek transcription of Middle Iranian form.

[*Aršak*]*ā ša iṭṭarridu* [<sup>m</sup>Ú-*r*]*u-da-a* LUGAL u <sup>f</sup>*Is-p[u-bar-za-a ...]* LBAT 1446:3 (SE 232; see Del Monte 1997: 255).

[<sup>f</sup>*I*]*s-pu-bar-za-a* NI[N]-*šú* GAŠAN LBAT 1446 r. 10', similarly LBAT 1164+ r. 12, 1171 r. 12'; (SE 234-236; see Del Monte 1997:255).

*Aršakam* LUGAL u <sup>f</sup>*Is-pu-bar-za-a* NIN-*šu* GAŠAN LBAT 1174 r. 12 (SE 236; see Del Monte 1997:255).

*Mitrā* (\*Miṭra-)<sup>77</sup>

Cutha

Alexander IV year 11 = 305 BC

<sup>m</sup>*Mit-ra-a* A <sup>md</sup>EN-[...] ZA 3 148f. No. 10:26 and rev. (witness, ring caption).

<sup>ACH</sup>*Mitradātā* (\*Miṭra-dāta-)<sup>78</sup>

Babylon

SE 200, 204, 212 = 111, 108, 100 BC

<sup>m</sup>*Mi-it-ra-da-ta*<sup>1</sup> *ta*<sup>1</sup>-*a* LÚ.GAL[L ...] Sachs-Hunger Diaries –111 C Flake 4'.

<sup>m</sup>*Mi-it-ra-da-ta* [LÚ.GAL *ú*]*qānu* 'Mithradata, the chief of troops (departed to the surroundings of Seleucia as before)' Sachs-Hunger Diaries -107 C rev. 15.

<sup>m</sup>*Mi-it-ra-da-ta-a* LÚ.GAL.GAL *úqānu* Sachs-Hunger Diaries –99 B 'Flake' 15' (see Del Monte 1997:164).

= Achaemenid Babylonian *Mitradātu*.<sup>79</sup>

<sup>ACH</sup>*Mitrātu* (\*Miṭrāta-)<sup>80</sup>

Babylon

91 BC, 84 BC

<sup>m</sup>*Mi-it-ra-a-tu* LÚ.GAL.GAL *uqān* Sachs-Hunger Diaries –90 obv. 15', 32', probably to be restored in ibid. [49'] (see Del Monte 1997:169).

[<sup>m</sup>*Mi*]-*it-ra-a-tu* *šuāti kī iš-pu-ru ú x* [...] [*re*<sup>2</sup>-*ṣ*]*u-tú šá* LÚ.ERÍN BI *šá* KA KI <sup>m</sup>*Mi-it-ra-a-tu* *šaknu* [...] '[...] when they sent [...] this [Mi]tratu [...] [hel]p<sup>2</sup> of these troops who had come to an agreement with Mitratu [...] Sachs-Hunger Diaries III –83 obv. 5'f.

<sup>m</sup>*Mi-it-ra-a-tu* LÚ.GAL.GAL *ú-qa* [...] Sachs-Hunger Diaries –83 obv. 21', also ibid. rev. 17, 19.

= Achaemenid Babylonian *Mitrāta*.<sup>81</sup>

*Mitriupastu* (\*Miṭra-upasta-)<sup>82</sup>

Babylon

Seleucus I year 8 = 304 BC

(list of outlays from 68 shekels of silver, staters of Alexander, the balance of x+8 shekels, price of a horse and<sup>2</sup> [...] of <sup>md</sup>*Mit-ri-ú-pa-as-tu*<sub>4</sub>: 40 shekels paid for 3

<sup>77</sup> Boiy 2000:333 sub 2118.

<sup>78</sup> Boiy 2000:333 sub 2119; Tavernier 2002:524.

<sup>79</sup> Tavernier 2002:522: 5 occurrences in Murašû texts; 1 from Ur, reign of Artaxerxes III.

<sup>80</sup> Zadok 1997a No. 15.

<sup>81</sup> Tavernier 2002:524: 2 occurrences in Murašû texts; 1 in a Kasr text; 1 from the reign of Darius I.

<sup>82</sup> Boiy 2000:333 sub 2119; Tavernier 2002:524.

KUŠ.PA *ana nabaizbāda* to king; 2 shekels for supplies for PN (Babylonian) sent to PN<sub>2</sub> (Greek); 2 shekels for expenses; balance 24 shekels) CT 4 29d:4, see McEwan 1985:170.

*Nabarzānu*<sup>83</sup> (\*Nāfa-bṛda-āna-)

Babylon.

Alexander III year 9 = 328 BC

Receipt for silver tithe of <sup>m</sup>*Barūqâ arad ša* <sup>m</sup>**Na-bar-za-nu** (for clearance of debris at Esagil) CT 49 6:2.<sup>84</sup>

*Pāpā* (\*Pāpa-)<sup>85</sup>

Babylon

SE 73 = 239 BC

(seal of) <sup>m</sup>**Pa-pa-a** (witness?) CT 49 130 upper edge.  
= Achaemenid Elamite, Aramaic \*Pāpa.<sup>86</sup>

*Piriustānā* (\*Pērūz-stāna<sup>?</sup>, \*Friya-<sup>h</sup>u-stāna-<sup>o</sup>?)<sup>87</sup>

Babylon

SE 244-243 = 69-68 BC

[ ... u <sup>f</sup>**Pi-ir-us-ta-na-a** DAM-[šú] LBA 17 r. 7' (SE 244; See Del Monte 1997:256).  
*Aršakā* LUGAL [u] <sup>f</sup>**Pi-ri-us-ta-na-a** DAM-šú LBAT 1447:3' (SE 244; see Del Monte 1997:256).

*Aršakam* LUGAL u <sup>f</sup>**Pi-ir-us-ta-na-a** DAM-šú GAŠAN LBAT 1448:3 (SE 244); also ACT 194a r. 9' (SE 243; see Del Monte 1997:256).

*Piršina* <sup>ʾ</sup> (\*Fa-rš-aina-<sup>ʾ</sup>)<sup>88</sup>

Babylon

SE 73 = 239 BC

[<sup>m</sup>x-x-x<sup>l</sup>-*ḥa*-<sup>ʾ</sup> A šá <sup>m</sup>**Pír-ši-na**-<sup>ʾ</sup> (witness) CT 49 130:4.  
[...A šá] <sup>m</sup>**Pír-ši-na**-<sup>ʾ</sup> CT 49 107+BM 32170:27 (= r. 8) (witness).

*Raznumitrā* (\*Razna-Miḏra-)<sup>89</sup>

Babylon

SE 229 = 82 BC

LÚ *puliṭē* u <sup>m</sup>**Ra-az-nu-mi-it-ra-a** LÚ.[...] Sachs-Hunger Diaries –81B rev. 5' (see Del Monte 1997:176).

---

<sup>83</sup> Tavernier 2002:527.

<sup>84</sup> See McEwan 1981:59.

<sup>85</sup> Boiy 2000:342 sub 2597.

<sup>86</sup> Tavernier 2002:534.

<sup>87</sup> McEwan 1986:93: “Peruztanâ”.

<sup>88</sup> Boiy 2000:342 sub 2607-08; cf. Tavernier 2002:461 sub 8.2.556

<sup>89</sup> Zadok 1997a No. 16; cf. Tavernier 2002:550f.; and especially Parthian *Ršnwmtr* Schmitt 1998:188 sub G4.



*Rē ʾinu?* (\*Raiv-ina-)<sup>90</sup>

Uruk

(Arsacid)

<sup>m</sup>Aršakā ʾu <sup>f</sup>Re-ʾ ʾl-**nu** AMA-šú LUGAL.MEŠ BRM 2 53:28 (see Oelsner 1995:147).

*Rēmā?* (\*Raiva-)<sup>91</sup>

Babylon

SE 37 = 275 BC

[... A šá <sup>m</sup>]ʾRe<sup>l</sup>-ma- ʾ CT 49 107 r. 9 (witness.)

*Tigrānu* (\*Tigra-āna-)

Babylon

SE 216 = 96 B.C.

[<sup>m</sup>T]**i-ig-ra-nu** mār šarri ša URU Armini Sachs-Hunger Diaries –95 D 11' (see Del Monte 1997:166).

*Urri ʾa* (\*Varya-)<sup>92</sup>

Babylon

SE 127 = 125 B.C.

<sup>m</sup>**Ur-ri-ʾ-a** ina URU Šurru GAZ Urri ʾa was killed in Šurru Sachs-Hunger Diaries –124 B 21'.

*Urudā, Urudēsu*<sup>93</sup> (\*Hu-rauda- ⇒ \*Urūd /wrwd/, Orodes)

Babylon

SE 204?, 232 = 108?, 80 BC

Aršakam LUGAL ša iṭṭarridu <sup>m</sup>**Ū-ru-da-a** LUGAL LBAT 1445:3 (see Del Monte 1997:254).

[A ršak]ā ša iṭṭarridu [<sup>m</sup>**Ū-r**]**u-da-a** LUGAL u <sup>f</sup>Is-p[u-bar-za-a ...] LBAT 1446:3 (see Del Monte 1997:255).

<sup>m</sup>**Ū-ru-de-e-su** LÚ.GAL ku-mar-ri ša É.MEŠ DINGIR.[MEŠ] Sachs-Hunger Diaries –107C Rev. 16 (see Del Monte 1997:157)

### Incerta and Dubia:

#### 1. Common Nouns

*iterišupātu?*

Babylon

[. . . . .] x x *tum* LÚ **i-teʾ-ri-šú-pa-ta-n**[*uʾ* .. ..] (in broken context) BM 32248 ++ rev. 3. (Chronicle: Ruin of Esagila, referring to reign of Antiochos I as crown prince.

<sup>90</sup> Cf. *Rywyn* /Rēw-in/: Schmitt 1998:188.

<sup>91</sup> Zadok 1997b No. 7. But this could also be the end of a longer name, e.g. [Arta]rēmā.

<sup>92</sup> Zadok 1997a No. 17.

<sup>93</sup> Into Babylonian from Greek, rather than from Iranian. Zadok 1997a No. 18, Boiy 2000:349 sub 2960.

Van der Spek ([http://www.livius.org/cg-cm/chronicles/bchp-ruin\\_esagila/ruin\\_esagila\\_03.html](http://www.livius.org/cg-cm/chronicles/bchp-ruin_esagila/ruin_esagila_03.html)): “possibly an Iranian title. The element *pa-ta* may be a rendering of *pāti*, ‘leader’ [and presumably with Akkadian plural marker *-ānu*—MWS] A possible candidate is the \*âthravapati, mentioned by Briant (1996, 260).”

*kumarru* in *rab kumar(ri)*? (\*Ir. kamarā-?) ‘belt’?<sup>94</sup>

Babylon

SE 182-239 = 129-73 BC

(Himeros [<sup>m</sup>*I-me-ru-us-su*], satrap) LÚ.GAL<sup>?</sup> **ku-mar** šá É LUGAL-ú-<sup>l</sup>*tú*<sup>l</sup> Sachs-Hunger Diaries –129A<sub>2</sub> Obv. 21 (see Del Monte 1997:132).

(Orodes? [<sup>m</sup>*Ú-ru-de-e-su*]) LÚ.GAL **ku-mar-ri** šá É.MEŠ DINGIR.[MEŠ] Sachs-Hunger Diaries –107C Rev. 16 (see Del Monte 1997:157; Van der Spek 2000:441).

(name lost) LÚ.GAL **ku-mar** šá É.MEŠ DINGIR.MEŠ Sachs-Hunger Diaries –72 Flake 10 (see Del Monte 1997:181).

## 2. Personal Names

*Astapanu*? (\*Asta-pāna-?)<sup>95</sup>

Babylon

Early Hellenistic

<sup>m</sup>**As-ta-pa-nu** šá i [...] (in broken context) CT 49 178:5 (administrative; Antiochus).<sup>96</sup>

<sup>ACH</sup>*Bēsu*? (\*Baisa-?)

Babylon

330 B.C.

<sup>m</sup>**Bi-I** <sup>e</sup>**l**-<sup>[es<sup>?</sup>-su<sup>?</sup>]</sup> (<sup>4</sup>) [<sup>ša</sup> <sup>m</sup>*Artakšatsu*?] <sup>šum</sup>šū B[essos], called [Artaxerxes] CT 37 22 = BCHP 98 No. 1 = Grayson Chronicles 112 No. 8:3, see Van der Spek, [http://www.livius.org/cg-cm/chronicles/bchp-alexander/alexander\\_02.html](http://www.livius.org/cg-cm/chronicles/bchp-alexander/alexander_02.html).  
= ? Achaemenid Babylonian *Bēsu*.<sup>97</sup> t t t

*Piritā*?? (\*Frita-?)<sup>98</sup>

Cutha

Alexander IV year 11 = 305 BC

(receipt for payment of silver, part of) *rašûtu ša* <sup>m</sup>**Pi-ri-ta-a** ša *ana muḥḫi* PN ZA 3 148f. No. 10:4.

<sup>94</sup> Cf. Telegdi 1935:254 sub 123: Taldmudic *qmwr*, *qmr* ʾ but cf. Mandaean *qwmr* ʾ. But if so, the first vowel is unexplained.

<sup>95</sup> Boiy 2000:295 sub 77; Zadok 1979:294. Otherwise Van der Spek 1986:125 n. 131, interpreting the name as Greek, Stephanos.

<sup>96</sup> Boiy 2000:295 sub 77; Zadok 1979:294. Otherwise Van der Spek 1986:125 n. 131, interpreting the name as Greek, Stephanos.

<sup>97</sup> Tavernier 2002:710 (twice in Murašû texts).

<sup>98</sup> Boiy 2000:342 sub 2606. Cf. Schmitt 1998:184 sub E.5 (*pṛt*); Tavernier 2002:632 sub 8.3.59 (\*Fritika-).

*Urraḥṣu*?? (\*Vārača-?, \*Xvara-°?)<sup>99</sup>

Babylon

SE 194 = 118 BC

[...] -x-na-a A šá *<sup>m</sup>Ba-ga-a-a-ʾ-šá ša ana muḥḥi* 4 LÚ.GAL ERÍN-ni.MEŠ ù *<sup>m</sup>Ur-ra-ah-šúʾ* LÚ.GAL ú-qa TA LÚ.GAL ERÍN-ni.MEŠ[...] the son of Bagayaʾaša who was above the four generals, and Urraḥṣú, the general Sachs-Hunger Diaries –119 C obv. 12 (see Del Monte 1997:148).

Delenda:

\*\**Aršainna* (\*Rša-aina)<sup>100</sup>

Babylon

SE 218 = 94 BC

(silver) *ana x x x l-ÁR šá in-nu* TA ÍD *ana* KISAL BÀN.DA šá É.SAG.ÍL CT 49 153:15; see Van der Spek 1998 217 No. 8, parallel *ana zebēlu ša innu* CT 152:6f., ibid. 219 No. 9.

\*\**Artamandiš* (\*Rta-vanta-?)

Despite McEwan 1986:91 (reading *<sup>m</sup>ár-tam-man-diš šá ak-ku-ú* LÚ.ŠÀ.TÀM É.SAG.GÍL u LÚ.E.KI.MEŠ, Diaries –77B Rev. 15 and supposing \*rtavanta- or \*rtavinda), rather— [...] -š UD.21 šá *akkú* etc. apud Sachs-Hunger Diaries III 502' see Boiy 2000:194.

*gadāja*?<sup>101</sup>

Uruk

SE 87-139 = 000 BC

(monthly and yearly together with) LÚ *ga-da-a-a* NCBT 1968:7 apud Doty 1977:110. (SE 125+x)

PN LÚ *ga-ad-da-a-a* BRM 2 27:11 and 27 (SE 87)

(property adjoining plot of) PN LÚ *ga-da-a-a* ša É.DINGIR.MEŠ BRM 2 42:8 (SE 151)

PN LÚ *gad-da-a-a* BRM 2 43:6 (SE153).

PN LÚ *gaḏ<sup>a</sup>-da-a-a* BRM 2 38:4 (SE 139).

Despite CAD G s.v. ("possibly OPers."), no plausible Iranian etymology is available.

<sup>99</sup> Cf., e.g. Avestan Varāza, Pahlavi Varāz /wlʾc/ Mayrhofer 1979:I/91 sub. 355, Gignoux 1986:II/173 sub. 940, 2003:65 sub 356, and similar names, Justi 1995:348f. Otherwise, cf. Parthian *wrḥšytk*, perhaps to be analyzed as °-\*xšaita-; Schmitt 1998:191?

<sup>100</sup> Zadok 1997b No. 1; Boiy 2000: 294 sub 69.

<sup>101</sup> McEwan 1981:184f.

## REFERENCES

- Beaulieu, Paul-Alain. 1989. "The Capacity of the *mašīhu* measure in Neo-Babylonian Eanna," *Notes Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires* 1989/65.
- Boiy, Tom. 2000. "Laatachamenidisch en hellenistisch babylon. Portret van een Mesopotamische stad in een cultureel spanningsveld." Dissertation, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven.
- Bongenaar, A.C.V.M. 1997. *The Neo-Babylonian Ebabbar Temple at Sippar: its Administration and its Prosopography*. Publications de l'Institut historique-archéologique néerlandaise de Stamboul 80. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten.
- Briant, Pierre. 1996. *Histoire de l'Empire perse*. Paris: Fayard.
- Dandamayev, Muhammad A. 1986. "Bagasarū ganzabara." In *Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft und Kulturkunde, Gedenkschrift für W. Brandenstein*, ed. Manfred Mayrhofer et al. = Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Kulturwissenschaft 14. Pp. 235-239.
- Dandamayev, Muhammad A. 1992. *Iranians in Achaemenid Babylonia*. Columbia Lectures on Iranian Studies 6. Costa Mesa, CA: Mazda.
- Dandamayev, Muhammad A. 1993. "zīnabarra," *Notes Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires* 1995/12.
- Del Monte, Giuseppe F. 1997. *Testi dalla Babilonia Ellenistica, I: Testi Cronografici*. Studi Ellenistici 9. Pisa, Rome: Istituti Editoriali e Poligrafici Internationale.
- Doty, L. Timothy. 1977. "Cuneiform Archives from Hellenistic Uruk." PhD dissertation, Yale University. University Microfilms No. 77-27.070.
- Doty, L. Timothy. 1978-79. "A Cuneiform Tablet from Tell 'Umar," *Mesopotamia* 13-14, 91-98.
- Eilers, Wilhelm. 1940. *Iranische Beamtennamen in der keilschriftlichen Überlieferung*. Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes 25/5. Leipzig.
- Gignoux, Philippe. 1986. *Iranisches Personennamenbuch, II: Mitteliranische Personennamen*, Fasz. 2: *Noms propres Sassanides en Moyen-Perse Épigraphique*. Vienna: Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Gignoux, Philippe. 2003. *Iranisches Personennamenbuch, II: Mitteliranische Personennamen*, Fasz. 3: *Noms propres sassanides en moyen-perse épigraphique*, Suppl. Vienna: Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Greenfield, Jonas C. ".\*hamarakara- > 'amarkal." In *Henning Memorial Volume*. London: Lund, Humphries. Pp. 181-186.

- Hinz, Walther. 1975. *Altiranisches Sprachgut der Nebenüberlieferungen*. Göttinger Orientforschungen II/3. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Joannès, Francis. 2000. *La Mésopotamie au 1<sup>er</sup> millénaire avant J.C.* Paris: Armand Colin.
- Joannès, Francis, ed. 2001. *Dictionnaire de la Civilisation Mésopotamienne*. Paris: Robert Laffont.
- Jursa, Michael. 1995. *Die Landwirtschaft in Sippar in neubabylonischer Zeit*. Archiv für Orientforschung Beiheft 25. Vienna.
- Justi, Ferdinand. 1895. *Iranisches Namenbuch*. Marburg: Elwert.
- ➔[Keen, A.G. 1998. "Persian *karanoi* and their Relationship to the Satrapal System." In *Ancient History in a Modern University, I: The Ancient Near East, Greece and Rome*, ed. T.W. Hillard et al. Grand Rapids and Cambridge. Pp. 88-95.]
- Kessler, Karlheinz. 2000. "Hellenistische Tempelverwaltungstexte. Eine Nachlese zu CT 49." In *Assyriologica et Semitica, Festschrift für Joachim Oelsner*, ed. Joachim Marzahn and Hanz Neumann, AOAT 252 (Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2000), 213-241.
- Kuhrt, Amélie. 1983. Review of *Priest and Temple in Hellenistic Babylonia*, by G.J.P. McEwan. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 1983 No. 2, 282-83.
- Mayrhofer, Manfred. *Iranisches Personennamenbuch, I: Die altiranischen Namen*. Vienna: Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- McEwan, Gilbert J. P. 1981. *Priest and Temple in Hellenistic Babylonia*. Freiburger Altorientalische Studien, 4. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.
- McEwan, Gilbert J. P. 1985. "The First Seleucid Document from Babylonia," *Journal of Semitic Studies* 30, 169-180.
- McEwan, Gilbert J.P. 1986. "A Parthian Campaign Against Elymais in 77 B.C." *Iran* 24, 91-94.
- Oelsner, Joachim. 1964. "Ein Beitrag zu keilschriftlichen Königstitulaturen in hellenistischer Zeit," *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 56, 262-274.
- Oelsner, Joachim. 1978. "Kontinuität und Wandel in Gesellschaft und Kultur in Babylonien in hellenistischer Zeit," *Klio* 60, 101-116.
- Oelsner, Joachim. 1981. "Gesellschaft und Wirtschaft des seleucidischen Babylonien. Einige Beobachtungen in den Keilschrifttexten aus Uruk," *Klio* 63, 39-44.
- Oelsner, Joachim. 1986. *Materialien zur babylonischen Gesellschaft und Kultur in hellenistischer Zeit*. Assyriologia, 7. Budapest: Eötvös University.

Oelsner, Joachim. 1991. "Griechen in Babylonien und die einheimischen Tempel in hellenistischer Zeit." In *La Circulations des biens, des personnes, et des idées dans le proche-orient ancien*, Actes de la XXXVIIIe Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, ed. D. Charpin and F. Joannès. Pp. 341-347.

Oelsner, Joachim. 1995. "Recht im hellenistischen Babylonien: Tempel-Sklaven-Schuldrecht-allgemeine Charakterisierung." In *Legal Documents of the Hellenistic World*, ed. M. J. Geller and H. Maehler. London: Warburg Institute. Pp. 106-148.

Oelsner, Joachim. 2000. "Von Iqīšâ und einigen anderen spätgeborenen Babyloniern," *Studi sul Vicino Oriente antico dedicati alla memoria di Luigi Cagni*, ed. Simonetta Graziani et al. Istituto Universitario Orientale, Dipartimento di Studi Asiatici, Series Minor, 61. Naples; Istituto Universitario Orientale; 2000 (appeared 2001). Pp. 797-814.

➔Pallis, Svend A. 1953. "The History of Babylon 538-93 B. C.." In *Festschrift Holger Pedersen*. Havniae 1953. Pp. 275-294

Rosenthal, Franz. 1995. *A Grammar of Biblical Aramaic*, 6<sup>th</sup> ed. Porta Linguarum Orientalium 5. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

➔[Sarkisjan, G. Ch. 1974. "Greek Personal Names in Uruk and the Gaeco-Babyloniaca Problem," *Acta Antiqua Hungarica* 22, 495-503.

Schmitt, Rüdiger. 1976. "Der Titel 'Satrap.'" In *Studies in Greek, Italic and Indo-European Linguistics offered to Leonard R. Palmer*, ed. A.M. Davies and W. Meid. Innsbruck. Pp. 373-390.

Schmitt, Rüdiger. 1998. "Parthische Sprach- und Namenüberlieferung aus Arsakidischer Zeit." In *Das Partherreich und seine Zeugnisse, The Arsacid Empire: Sources and Documentation*, ed. Josef Wiesehöfer. Historia, Einzelschriften 122. (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1998), 163-204.

von Soden 1982. (Review of McEwan 1981). *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 71, 292-296.

Stolper, Matthew W. 1985. (Review of McEwan 1981). *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 105, 141-142.

Stolper, Matthew W. 1989. "The Governor of Babylon and Across-the-River in 486 B.C.," *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 48, 283-305.

Stolper, Matthew W. 1990. "Late Achaemenid Texts from Uruk and Larsa," *Baghdader Mitteilungen* 21, 559-622.

Stolper, Matthew W. 1993. "Late Achaemenid, Early Macedonian, and Early Hellenistic Records of Deposit and Related Texts," Suppl. 77 to *Annali* 53, fasc. 4.

Stolper, Matthew W. 1996. "A Paper Chase after the Aramaic on TCL 13 193," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 116, 517-521.

- Stolper, Matthew W. 2000. "ganzabara," *Encyclopaedia Iranica* 10/3 (2000), 286-288.
- Stolper, Matthew W. 2001. "Texts of the Murašûs and from their Surroundings," *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 53, 83-132.
- Telegdi, S. 1935. "Essai sur la phonétique des emprunts Iraniens en Araméen Talmudique," *Journal asiatique* 226 (1935), 177-256.
- Van der Spek, Robartus J. 1985. "The Babylonian Temple during the Macedonian and Parthian Domination," *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 45, 542-562.
- Van der Spek, Robartus J. 1986. *Grondbezit in het Seleucidische Rijk*. Amsterdam: VU Uitgeverij.
- Van der Spek, Robartus J. 1987. "The Babylonian City." In A. Kuhrt and S. Sherwin White (eds.), *Hellenism in the East*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press. Pp. 57-74.
- Van der Spek, Robartus J. 1992. "Nippur, Sippar and Larsa in the Hellenistic Period." In Maria DeJ. Ellis (ed.), *Nippur at the Centennial* (CRRAI 35 [1988]). Philadelphia: University Museum. Pp. 235-260.
- Van der Spek, Robartus, J. 1993. "The Astronomical Diaries as a Source for Achaemenid and Seleucid History," *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 50, 91-101.
- Van der Spek, Robartus J. 1995. "Land Ownership in Babylonian Cuneiform Documents." In M.J. Geller and H. Maehler (eds.), *Legal Documents of the Hellenistic World*. London: Warburg Institute. Pp. 173-245.
- Van der Spek, Robartus J. 1997/1998. "New Evidence from Babylonian Astronomical Diaries Concerning Seleucid and Arsacid History," *Archiv für Orientforschung* 44/45, 167-175.
- Van der Spek, Robartus J. 1998. "Cuneiform Documents on Parthian History: the Raḥimesu Archive." In *Das Partherreich und seine Zeugnisse, The Arsacid Empire: Sources and Documentation*, ed. Josef Wiesehöfer. Historia, Einzelschriften 122. (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1998), 205-258.
- Van der Spek, Robartus. 2000. "The Šatammus of Esagila in the Seleucid and Arsacid Periods." In *Assyriologica et Semitica, Festschrift für Joachim Oelsner*, ed. Joachim Marzahn and Hanz Neumann, AOAT 252 (Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2000), 437-446.
- Van der Spek, Robartus. 2001. "The Theatre of Babylon in Cuneiform." In *Veenhof Anniversary Volume*, ed. W.H. van Soldt et al. Publications de l'Institut historique-archéologique néerlandais de Stamboul, 89. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten. 445-456.

- Zadok, Ran. 1981. Review of The Bisitun Inscription of Darius the Great, by Elizabeth N. Von Voigtlander. *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 38, 657-665.
- Zadok, Ran. 1983. "Lexical and Onomastic Notes," *Oriens Antiquus* 22, 217-220.
- Zadok, Ran. 1997a. "Some Iranian Anthroponyms and Toponyms," *Notes Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires* 1997/7.
- Zadok, Ran. 1997b. "Some Iranians in Cuneiform Documents," *Notes Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires* 1997/149.
- Zadok, Ran. 2002. "An Achaemenid queen," *Notes Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires* 2002/65.
- Zadok, Ran. 2003. "Updating the Apammu Dossier," *Notes Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires* 2003/33.